UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,166	08/01/2003	Osamu Ueda	B588-637 (25815.653)	4594
	7590 06/23/200 OWITZ & LATMAN	EXAMINER		
JOHN J TORRENTE			HENN, TIMOTHY J	
1133 AVE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 10036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/23/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/633,166	UEDA ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Timothy J. Henn	2622				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	<b>\].</b> nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 A <sub>k</sub>	<u>oril 2009</u> .					
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 14 and 18-20 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 14 and 18-20 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		ny the Everiner				
10) The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 July 2007</u> is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		• •				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list.	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)  1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) ☑ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5)  Notice of Informal P	ate				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) 🔲 Other:					

Art Unit: 2622

## **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 28 April 2009 has been entered.

## Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2622

4. Claims 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nakano et al. (US 2004/0046884).

# [claim 14]

5. Regarding claim 14, Nakano discloses an imaging apparatus comprising: an image pickup element having an imaging area in which a plurality of light receiving elements are two-dimensionally arranged (Figure 7, Item 3; Figure 2); a zoom operation unit for a user to operate expansion or reduction of an image (Figure 7, Item 18; Paragraphs 0066-0067); and a controller (Figure 7, Item 11; Paragraph 0030) that controls to mix a first number of pixel signals in the image pickup element, which is output from the plurality of light receiving elements in a first area of the imaging area, in a case that a first magnification is set by the zoom operation unit (Figure 9; Area A; 4-pixel mixing; Paragraph 0074 and 0077), and to mix a second number of pixel signals in the image pickup element, which is output from the plurality of light receiving elements in a second area, which is smaller than the first area, of the imaging area, in a case that a second magnification, which is larger than the first magnification, is set by the zoom operation unit, wherein the second number is smaller than the first number (Figure 9, Area B; 3-pixel mixing; Paragraphs 0074 and 0077).

## [claim 18]

6. Claim 18 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus claim 14. Therefore, claim 18 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 14.

Art Unit: 2622

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 19 and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakano et al. (US 2004/0046884) in view of Ito (JP 2002-199266 A).

### [claim 19]

9. Regarding claim 19, Nakano discloses a mode for 2-pixel mixture (Figure 9, Area C; 2-pixel mixing; Paragraphs 0074 and 0077), but does not disclose a further third mode where the pixels are not mixed as claimed. Ito discloses that when a zoom is increased past a point where 2-pixel mixture is performed, the pixels should be read out without mixing, thereby preventing deterioration of the image (Abstract). Therefore, it would be obvious to add a third mode as claimed wherein pixels are readout without mixing so that the magnification ratio could be increased without deteriorating the image.

#### [claim 20]

10. Claim 20 is a method claim corresponding to apparatus claim 19. Therefore, claim 20 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 19.

#### Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2622

Burks et al. US 2004/0165080

ii. Fukuda US 7,265,783

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy J. Henn whose telephone number is (571) 272-7310. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 11-7.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Ometz can be reached on (571) 272-7593. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Timothy J Henn/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622 Application/Control Number: 10/633,166

Page 6

Art Unit: 2622